

# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 11, 2001

## CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Meeting Room "A" of the Beaverton Public Library at 12375 SW Fifth Street.

## ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Gary Bliss, Russell Davis, Eric Johansen and Dan Maks. Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard and Brian Lynott were excused.

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Associate Planner Veronica Smith and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting.

## VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item.

NICHOLAS COCO mentioned that he had been informed of this work session at a Neighborhood Meeting and would like to express his concerns with a development occurring in his neighborhood.

Chairman Voytilla and Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Coco that the Planning Commission is not able to hear testimony regarding a specific development at this work session.

Mr. Coco expressed his opinion that trees are important, adding that in addition to a visual buffer, they provide sound and light absorption.

## STAFF COMMUNICATION:

On question, staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

**NEW BUSINESS:****WORK SESSION:****A. TREE INVENTORY:**

Workshop to discuss preliminary inventory results from the fieldwork conducted by staff. Discussion may include new inventory categories, revised inventory methodology and revised timelines for completion.

Senior Planner Barbara Fryer described a Staff Memorandum dated July 5, 2001, regarding the current tree inventory, highlighting the three specific categories, including individual trees, groves of trees and tree corridors. She reviewed the specific sections that had been completed, including Section 1S1-14, located from Western Avenue over to Apple Way; Section 1N1-W31, which is located off of Cornell Boulevard, from 185<sup>th</sup> Avenue almost to 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Section 1S1-15, which is the approximate area from Canyon Road, down Western Avenue to Allen Boulevard and Hall Boulevard; and most of Section 1S1-17, although some of the larger groves have not been completed because staff is obtaining data from the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) for areas that are publicly-owned.

Ms. Fryer mentioned that staff has identified areas that could be groves or neighborhood groves of trees in Section 17. She referred to the Four Seasons area, observing that this could be considered a neighborhood grove of trees, adding that there are significant numbers of Douglas Fir or Ponderosa Pine that are located among the homes in this area. Noting that most of these trees are much greater than twelve inches in diameter, she stated that many are probably thirty inches in diameter. She pointed out that these trees have been in this neighborhood for a long time are significant resources in terms of how the landscape of this particular neighborhood is viewed. Noting that as a grove of trees, these trees would not be considered significant and that this could possibly be the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Ms. Fryer referred to the maps illustrating Section 15, observing that staff has pretty much identified a grove of trees, adding that the flowering plum trees located along Hall Boulevard and the trees located along Allen Boulevard are also potential corridor trees. She pointed out that some of the trees are impacted by a right-of-way and lopped off to accommodate trucks, emphasizing that there are some issues associated with those trees. Referring to the neighborhood south of Fifth Street west of Lombard Avenue, she stated that several resources have been identified, including Douglas Fir trees, Oak trees, Tamarack trees, Ponderosa Pine and Oregon Ash. She pointed out that the area around Elsie Stuhr has a lot of significant trees in the back, adding that they have been identified individually but function more as a neighborhood grove.

1 Referring to Section 31, which includes a portion of Willow Creek, Ms. Fryer  
2 observed that there are a number of significant groves of trees that are currently  
3 designated and qualify under this program. She referred to Autumn Ridge Park,  
4 which is part of Grove G-23, adding that a portion of this grove is located south of  
5 Autumn Ridge Drive, which includes a large stand of huge oak trees, primarily in  
6 the back yards of individual homes. She pointed out that most of the homes in  
7 this neighborhood are actually hidden from view by these tree resources,  
8 requesting direction of whether this should be identified as a neighborhood grove  
9 of trees, rather than a grove of trees or individual trees. She mentioned that these  
10 trees are obviously surviving as a portion of a grove of trees in spite of the  
11 surrounding development.

12  
13 Ms. Fryer referred to Section 14, noting that several areas are potential  
14 neighborhood groves of trees. She mentioned areas such as A. M. Kennedy Park,  
15 adding that the surrounding tax lots might be part of that grove of trees and could  
16 be a potential neighborhood grove of trees. Referring to the large back yards  
17 forming groves of trees in this area, she mentioned that the owners of trees  
18 located in a back yard frequently clear out the under story and they do not meet  
19 the criteria as a grove of trees or significant.

20  
21 Ms. Fryer discussed Section 16, which she identified as having the oldest plot of  
22 land in the City of Beaverton, adding that staff has identified numerous tree  
23 resources that could potentially be significant. She mentioned Grove 16-1, and  
24 referred to a grove of Oregon White Oak Trees. She discussed Grove 16-2,  
25 noting that there has been development in this area, which has several Pine trees  
26 and Oregon White Oak Trees in this grove of trees, which covers approximately  
27 five tax lots.

28  
29 Ms. Fryer mentioned Section 16-3, which is the area around Schiffler Park,  
30 adding that the area includes deep back yards on the corner of Berthold Street and  
31 Erickson Street. She provided illustrations and photographs on the overhead  
32 projector depicting certain trees throughout the City of Beaverton, adding that  
33 some of the trees are growing with ivy, although the majority of the trees are in  
34 good health.

35  
36 Referring to Section 16-4, which is located off of Larson Street and Erickson  
37 Street, Ms. Fryer mentioned that this grove of trees includes primarily Douglas Fir  
38 trees, Cedar trees and Oregon White Oak trees, and several others to be identified  
39 at a later time. She pointed out that native trees typically score higher,

40  
41 7:22 p.m. – Principal Planner Hal Bergsma arrived.

42  
43 Ms. Fryer mentioned Grove 16-5, which is located on Bonnie Brae Street and  
44 Menlo Road, noting that this currently consists of a portion of Grove G-59 and  
45 Grove G-68, as well as other resources that are not currently identified.

46

1 Ms. Fryer discussed the feasibility of an educational program for homeowners  
2 identifying groves of trees within their neighborhoods.

3  
4 Ms. Fryer discussed an area in Eichler Park, which includes some Cottonwood  
5 trees, Fir trees and Ponderosa Pine trees, adding that this is a potential grove of  
6 trees.

7  
8 Referring to Grove 20, Ms. Fryer noted that this grove is located off of Allen  
9 Boulevard near Erickson Street and that this grove includes Douglas Fir, Oregon  
10 Oak, Ponderosa Pine and Maple trees and is a potential neighborhood grove of  
11 trees.

12  
13 Referring to Grove G-51, at the corner of Main Street and Twelfth Street, Ms.  
14 Fryer stated that this might not be appropriate, primarily because these trees are  
15 located behind homes.

16  
17 Ms. Fryer mentioned Grove G-52, which is in the same area as G-51, noting that  
18 this grove includes numerous big old trees.

19  
20 Referring to Grove G-53, which is located at City Park, Ms. Fryer stated that  
21 while this grove does not rate highly, she considers it a significant resource.

22  
23 Ms. Fryer mentioned Groves G-54 and G-55, along Central Creek, observing that  
24 these groves consist of many Oak Trees and that the southern portion more native  
25 in nature in terms of a wetland resource. She pointed out that the area north of  
26 Grove G-54 is primarily a large group of Oak Trees, adding that the canopies of  
27 these huge trees frequently touch.

28  
29 Ms. Fryer discussed Grove G-60, which is located along 141<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Allen  
30 Boulevard. She pointed out that this grove consists of several different properties  
31 and several trees, including Douglas Fir and Oregon White Oak. She expressed  
32 her opinion that while this particular grove does not have a high rating, it does  
33 provide an aesthetic contribution to that neighborhood.

34  
35 Ms. Fryer provided an illustration of Section 1S1-16, observing that this identifies  
36 potential groupings for Neighborhood Groves of Trees.

37  
38 Ms. Fryer discussed the area located to the west of Beaverton High School,  
39 specifically the Fairmont Drive/Third Street area, noting that this area includes a  
40 significant number of large Evergreen Trees, not all of which are native.  
41 Neighborhood grove. Concluding, she mentioned that she, as well as Mr.  
42 Bergsma or Associate Planner Veronica Smith, would be happy to respond to any  
43 questions or comments.  
44

1 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that the trees and groves most likely  
2 did not rate very highly because the criteria that had been developed is too strict  
3 and that some of the criteria should be weighted.  
4

5 Observing that both of Commissioner Maks' statements are correct, Ms. Fryer  
6 expressed her opinion that the criteria is too strict in certain circumstances,  
7 particularly where the resource covers more than one tax lot and has already been  
8 developed. She mentioned that another issue is that the City of Beaverton does  
9 not really have adequate staff time to go out and perform the detailed work that  
10 has been done on these maps throughout the remainder of the City.  
11

12 Commissioner Maks requested clarification that if a group of trees appears semi-  
13 significant, rather than identifying one or two as significant trees, they should be  
14 classified as a Neighborhood Grove.  
15

16 Ms. Fryer stated that if a grove of trees is located in a developed area, less than a  
17 15% forest canopy would result in low aesthetic value; a 23% forest canopy and  
18 partially visible grove of trees would have a moderate aesthetic value; and a  
19 greater than 50% forest canopy that is partially visual would receive a high score.  
20 She discussed issues involving any grove affecting more than five tax lots, which  
21 is approximately ½ an acre.  
22

23 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of determining whether a grove  
24 affects more than five tax lots.  
25

26 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that she reviewed the aerial photographs,  
27 adding that this would be determined if tree canopy of a grove covers five tax lots  
28 or is located in an area that involves more than ½ an acre. She mentioned that if  
29 more than ten tax lots are affected, this would involve a neighborhood issue.  
30

31 Commissioner Maks assured Ms. Fryer that he has no problem with identifying  
32 these resources in this manner.  
33

34 Ms. Fryer pointed out that the last two categories, in terms of age and the number  
35 of trees in the grove, are exactly the same as for a grove.  
36

37 Commissioner Maks questioned how a Neighborhood Grove fits into the  
38 Development Code.  
39

40 Ms. Fryer informed that the Development Code does not include a Neighborhood  
41 Grove at this time.  
42

43 Observing that he had just completed Code Review, Commissioner Maks advised  
44 Ms. Fryer that he is aware of this but would like clarification of where she  
45 anticipates this would fit in to the future Development Code.  
46

1 Ms. Fryer clarified that these Neighborhood Groves would be similar to  
2 community trees, but with an educational component, adding that citizens would  
3 receive educational materials regarding the different components of the trees as a  
4 resource for them and the entire community. She pointed out that trees alleviate a  
5 lot of water issues, adding that the general population is not aware of this, adding  
6 that the City Arborist could possibly go to individual homeowners and help them  
7 to address specific issues.

8  
9 Commissioner Maks questioned whether Ms. Fryer anticipates any possibility that  
10 certain areas would be designated as Neighborhood Groves within older areas that  
11 are zoned R-5 but actually built at R-7 or R-10 standards. He emphasized that  
12 this involves identifying something in a fashion in which it has not been identified  
13 before.

14  
15 Mr. Bergsma expanded on Ms. Fryer's comments, adding that many options are  
16 available, within the limits of the law and that staff is attempting to protect trees  
17 to a greater degree than in the past without totally prohibiting the cutting of trees.  
18 Observing that the trees add to the character of a neighborhood, he emphasized  
19 that there must be a balance, allowing for the removal of unhealthy or  
20 insignificant trees in some situations without changing the character of the  
21 neighborhood.

22  
23 Commissioner Maks pointed out that while he approves of the identification of  
24 the Neighborhood Grove, he is concerned with how it will fit into the  
25 Development Code.

26  
27 Ms. Smith referred to an earlier discussion regarding mitigation, suggesting that a  
28 Mitigation Program be developed for the identification of trees that are significant  
29 or have been planted in order to meet landscape requirements. She emphasized  
30 that the overall objective is to limit the loss of tree canopy, adding that identifying  
31 trees is a separate issue from determining significance.

32  
33 Chairman Voytilla referred to the methodology developed for the criteria,  
34 agreeing with Commissioner Maks' statement that this criteria is perhaps a little  
35 harsh and should be revised or adjusted.

36  
37 Commissioner Maks indicated that he intends to select four or five areas and go  
38 out and make his own determination.

39  
40 Chairman Voytilla referred to Grove G-60, which Ms. Fryer had described as  
41 aesthetically significant, observing that aesthetically this grove had been rated  
42 zero.

43  
44 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that this particular grove, which she  
45 considers as aesthetically significant, had received a zero rating because it is not  
46 visible from a collector or arterial street.

1 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that it would be necessary to determine, in terms of  
2 actual points, the threshold of significance.

3  
4 Commissioner Maks pointed out that this has not been addressed.

5  
6 Ms. Fryer concurred, noting that she had considered 50% to be the cutoff for  
7 determination of significance. She explained that staff is attempting to obtain  
8 accurate information regarding available resources, adding that this determination  
9 is based on aerial photographs. Observing that staff is trying to assess every  
10 resource, at which point they would weight and determine the significance of each  
11 resource, stressing that the entire project involves multiple stages.

12  
13 Observing that this is a lengthy process, Chairman Voytilla questioned the  
14 feasibility of deriving any benefit from somewhat triaging this and inventorying  
15 certain public and prioritized properties and addressing the other areas at a later  
16 time.

17  
18 Ms. Fryer mentioned that this is feasible, emphasizing that it is more efficient to  
19 address all resources within an area at the same time.

20  
21 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of whether he should consider more  
22 towards weighting criteria in a point system or absolute level when reviewing  
23 these resources.

24  
25 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that she would like him to consider where  
26 a specific resource actually fails, particularly how it could be rated differently to  
27 receive additional points.

28  
29 Commissioner Maks mentioned that these issues, such as being able to view a  
30 resource from a public right-of-way or whether an individual could actually touch  
31 the tree, had been discussed when the criteria had been developed.

32  
33 Ms. Fryer mentioned that a secondary issue involves how much time was  
34 necessary to review the resource and respond to the questions.

35  
36 Commissioner Maks mentioned that Ms. Fryer is possibly a better judge of these  
37 resources, adding that while he feels comfortable determining the value of the  
38 canopy of a Douglas Fir, he does not feel so knowledgeable with other types of  
39 trees.

40  
41 Mr. Bergsma discussed the rating of the resources, specifically how detailed and  
42 precise this should be, including location, quantity and quality of the under story.

43  
44 Ms. Fryer emphasized that it is important to keep in mind sufficient information  
45 to make a determination.

46

1 Chairman Voytilla questioned the availability of maps to assist in locating the  
2 resources.

3  
4 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that she anticipates having maps available  
5 by Monday, July 16, 2001, adding that these could be delivered to the  
6 Commissioners.

7  
8 Ms. Fryer referred to the Neighborhood Groves, whether the Commissioners feel  
9 comfortable with allowing staff to review these resources and when and in what  
10 format they would like to receive feedback.

11  
12 Chairman Voytilla suggested that staff review as many of these resources as  
13 possible and provide several locations for the Commissioners to review.

14  
15 Commissioner Maks questioned whether Ms. Fryer would consider Dapplegray  
16 Street to be a Neighborhood Grove.

17  
18 Ms. Fryer agreed that Dapplegray Street could be considered a Neighborhood  
19 Grove, suggesting that the Commissioners also review the potential resources  
20 within their own neighborhoods.

21  
22 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

23  
24 Observing that nothing is scheduled and there would be no meeting for two  
25 weeks, Chairman Voytilla suggested that two weeks should provide sufficient  
26 time from Monday to review the maps that Ms. Fryer is providing.

27  
28 Ms. Smith mentioned that a Work Session for the 2020 TSP Update is scheduled  
29 for August 1, 2001.

30  
31 Commissioner Maks suggested that the tree inventory could be discussed again in  
32 approximately two or three weeks.

33  
34 Chairman Voytilla questioned the possibility of discussing the tree inventory the  
35 following week, on August 8, 2001.

36  
37 Ms. Smith advised Chairman Voytilla that two Conditional Use Permits have  
38 been scheduled for August 8, 2001.

39  
40 Commissioner Maks mentioned that he had intended to review four or five  
41 resources and e-mailing his conclusions to Ms. Fryer.

42  
43 Suggesting that the Commission might benefit from another discussion, Chairman  
44 Voytilla emphasized that these decisions should be made as a group and that he  
45 would prefer to address this at a Work Session.

46



1 Ms. Smith suggested that the Tree Inventory could be discussed again on July 25,  
2 2001.

3  
4 Commissioner Maks and Chairman Voytilla both indicated that they would not be  
5 available on July 25, 2001.

6  
7 Ms. Smith suggested that the issue could be discussed on August 9, 2001.

8  
9 Mr. Bergsma expressed concern that August 9, 2001 is nearly a month, adding  
10 that he would like to address this issue sooner.

11  
12 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that with two weeks without a meeting, it would be  
13 necessary to have adequate time to review the groves.

14  
15 Commissioner Maks suggested that the 2020 TSP Update could be rescheduled  
16 from August 1, 2001.

17  
18 Ms. Smith advised Commissioner Maks that August 1, 2001 is a critical date for  
19 the 2020 TSP Update.

20  
21 Mr. Bergsma suggested that the Tree Inventory could be first on the Agenda,  
22 adding that this could be completed in thirty minutes.

23  
24 Commissioner Maks agreed that the first half hour of the August 1, 2001 meeting  
25 could be reserved to discuss criteria for the Tree Inventory.

26  
27 Ms. Fryer indicated that she would have the necessary maps distributed on  
28 Monday, July 16, 2001.

29  
30 Chairman Voytilla requested that Ms. Fryer include an outline of the dates she  
31 would like to receive information with the map.

32  
33 Mr. Coco indicated that he would like to discuss an area that has just been  
34 incorporated into the City of Beaverton that has trees located on it.

35  
36 Chairman Voytilla advised Mr. Coco that this issue is not on the agenda at this  
37 time, adding that the Commission is discussing certain issues at this time and that  
38 the visitor's opportunity to address the Commission is over.

39  
40 Mr. Coco pointed out that he had a quick question for a member of the staff.

41  
42 Chairman Voytilla informed Mr. Coco that he should address his question to staff  
43 quietly and allow the Commission to conduct their business.

44  
45 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that identification of regionally significant resources,  
46 specifically wetlands and riparian areas, involves a certain process, adding that he

1 is hoping that the program would allow for some flexibility. On question, he  
2 advised Chairman Voytilla that this involves not just wildlife, but the Fish and  
3 Wildlife Species Act, adding that the focus is on riparian areas.

4  
5 The meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.